

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, the title has been amended to be more descriptive.

Claims 1 and 3 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-11 remain pending in this application.

Title

The title was indicated as not being descriptive. In reply, the title has been amended to be more descriptive.

Claim objections

Claim 3 was objected to. Claim 3 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicants submit that the objection has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,747,036 to Erdmann (“Erdmann”). Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application No. 1,436/1981 (“Japan ‘436”). Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,801,530 to Crosby et al. (“Crosby”). Claims 2 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosby. Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosby in view of Japan ‘436. Claims 1 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,522,254 to Yamano (“Yamano”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a sensor device comprising “a coated electric wire wound around a detection circuit in a planar manner so as to electrostatically shield the detection circuit, wherein the electric wire is coated with an insulating material.” The references cited in the above rejections fail to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Japan ‘436, as disclosed in the present specification on page 1, discloses a proximity sensor with an insulating film with a conductor pattern thereon wound around a printed circuit board. By contrast, claim 1 requires a coated electric wire wound around a detection circuit. The insulating film with conductor pattern thereon of Japan ‘436 is not a coated electric wire as in claim 1. Thus, Japan ‘436 fails to suggest the invention of claim 1.

Erdmann discloses an electrostatic shield 15 which is constructed of silver or tin plated copper wire (col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 6). The wires of the Erdmann shield 15, however, are not coated with an insulating film as required by claim 1, but instead are plated with a metal. Moreover, the wires of the Erdmann shield 15 are not wound around in a planar manner as required by claim 1. Instead, the Erdman wires are arranged to form a shield that is only cylindrical in shape (See Fig. 1).

The Office Action equates the strip 78 or plates 300 of Crosby with the coated electric wire of claim 1. In contrast to the wire of claim 1, however, neither the strip 78 nor the plates 300 are coated with an insulating material. Moreover, neither the strip 78 nor the plates 300 are wires. Further, with respect to the plates 300, the plates are not wound. Thus, Crosby also fails to suggest all the features of claim 1.

Yamano discloses an insect screen 12 with woven metal fibers that can exhibit some shielding effect (col. 8, lines 6-12). Yamana, however, does not disclose that the metal fibers are coated with an insulating material, in contrast to the wire of claim 1.

The Office Action on page 7 states that it would have been obvious to have wound the screen 12 around the entire light receiving element/detection circuit board of Yamano. Applicants respectfully disagree. The main function of the screen 12 of Yamano is as an insect repelling screen. There would have been no need to wrap the insect screen 12 of

Yamano completely around any circuit board of Yamano, and such a wrapping would have made the Yamano device unwieldy.

Moreover, none of the references suggests the advantages of the device of claim 1, where an electric wire coated with an insulating material is wound around a detection circuit in a planar manner so as to electrostatically shield the detection circuit. By winding with the coated wire, the electrostatic shield may be formed with a flexibility and ease (See present specification on pages 25 and 26, for example) not suggested by the references cited in the rejection of the claims.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 16, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438